

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

10 IN RE BEXTRA AND CELEBREX MARKETING, ) CASE NO. MDL No. 1699 # 1957  
SALES PRACTICE, AND PRODUCT LIABILITY )  
LITIGATION )

This Document Relates to: ) **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING**  
12 Adams, Carol 05-1699 CRB ) **PFIZER DEFENDANTS' JOINT**  
13 Berry, Dorothy 05-1699 CRB ) **MOTION SEEKING ORDER**  
14 Clack, Edwin 06-6020 CRB ) **DISMISSING PLAINTIFFS'**  
15 Garcia, Irma 05-1699 CRB ) **CLAIMS WITH PREJUDICE OR**  
16 Hamilton, Sarah Jay 06-6080 CRB ) **OTHER APPROPRIATE**  
17 Hormel, Todd Conrad 06-6081 CRB ) **SANCTIONS**  
18 John, Richard 07-0473 CRB ) **(COMPLIANCE MOTION NO. 6)**  
19 Kenwood, James 05-1699 CRB ) Date: October 12, 2007  
20 Matthews, Harold 06-5848 CRB ) Time: 10:00 A.M.  
21 Moore, Deborah 05-1699 CRB ) Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer  
22 Myers, Gary 07-1517 CRB )  
23 Phlegm, Lawrence 05-1699 CRB )  
24 Pierluisses, Rafael 05-1699 CRB )  
25 Routt, Delorious 06-2392 CRB )  
26 Salgado, Manuela 05-1699 CRB )  
27 Youngblood, Patricia 05-1699 CRB )

22 THIS MATTER having come before the Court on the Pfizer Defendants' Expedited  
23 Motion Seeking Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims With Prejudice; the parties having received  
24 due notice and having had the opportunity to be heard; and this Court having considered all  
25 submissions made in support of and in opposition to the motion, finds as follows:

26 Plaintiffs listed in the caption to this Order have failed to comply with Pretrial Order  
27 No. 6 (“PTO 6”) by failing to provide defendants a completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”),

1 correctly executed authorizations, and responsive documents or provide notice that none are in  
2 the possession of plaintiff or plaintiff's counsel (collectively, "the discovery required by  
3 PTO 6"). Plaintiffs also have failed to comply with the order issued by the Special Master,  
4 Judge Fern M. Smith (Ret.), on August 9, 2007, requiring plaintiffs to provide the discovery  
5 required by PTO 6 within twenty-one days of entry of that Order or face dismissal with prejudice  
6 ("the compliance order"). The plaintiffs' failure is particularly egregious given the numerous  
7 efforts the Court and the parties have made to provide notice of plaintiffs' discovery obligations.  
8 (See Pfizer Defs.' Mem. of P. & A. in Supp. of Mot., at 2-6; Declaration of Stuart M. Gordon in  
9 Supp. of Pfizer Defendants' Mot. to Dismiss, ¶¶ 3-20.)

10 Based on these failures, the Court also finds as follows:

11 (1) The public's interest in expeditious resolution of this litigation is compromised by  
12 the plaintiffs' failure to comply with PTO 6 and the Special Master's compliance order. This  
13 Court and the public have an overriding interest in securing the just, speedy, and inexpensive  
14 determination of every action. Plaintiffs' delay is unreasonable and has impeded the resolution  
15 of these matters.

16 (2) The Court's need to manage its docket is compromised by the plaintiffs' failure to  
17 comply with PTO 6 and the Special Master's compliance order. The Court cannot effectively  
18 move forward with the cases in which plaintiffs have provided the required discovery when other  
19 plaintiffs have failed to do so. Dismissal of these plaintiffs will serve to appropriately penalize  
20 these plaintiffs for their non-compliance and also will encourage other plaintiffs to comply with  
21 this Court's case management orders.

22 (3) Defendants are prejudiced by the plaintiffs' failure to comply with PTO 6 and the  
23 Special Master's compliance order. Without the discovery required by PTO 6, the Pfizer  
24 Defendants cannot defend themselves because they have no information about the individual  
25 plaintiffs or the plaintiffs' injuries outside the allegations of the complaint. The defendants are  
26 also prejudiced by the loss of evidence and memory that attend the delay in providing required  
27 discovery, factors that are aggravated by the complexity of this litigation.

1 (4) The public policy favoring disposition on the merits is overridden by plaintiffs' 2 failure to comply with PTO 6 and the Special Master's compliance order. The Court finds that 3 plaintiffs' failure to provide the required discovery obstructs resolution of their claims on the 4 merits. A case that is stalled or unreasonably delayed by a party's failure to comply with 5 deadlines and discovery obligations cannot move forward toward resolution on the merits. 6 Accordingly, this dismissal factor does not weigh in favor of plaintiffs at all.

7 (5) There are no less drastic sanctions available to force the plaintiffs to comply with  
8 this Court's orders. The Court finds that PTO 6 and the Special Master's compliance order both  
9 provide specific warnings stating that claims may be dismissed with prejudice for failure to  
10 comply with discovery obligations. The Court also finds that Plaintiffs received warning letters  
11 from Defendants that prompted no response.

12       Accordingly, after weighing the dismissal factors discussed in *Malone v. U.S. Postal*  
13 *Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987), and *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab.*  
14 *Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 2006), and in light of this Court’s role in overseeing this  
15 multidistrict litigation, the Court hereby finds that dismissal of these plaintiffs’ claims with  
16 prejudice is warranted.

17 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the Pfizer Defendants' Expedited  
18 Motion is GRANTED and the claims of the plaintiffs listed in this caption are DISMISSED  
19 WITH PREJUDICE. 

20 | IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 12, 2007

HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE